CRM Bulletin

Volume 8 No. 1 Cultural Resources Management • A National Park Service Technical Bulletin
February 1985

Landscape Thinking

Robert Z. Melnick, ASLA

Today's rural landscape not only represents the integration of natural and human forces, but also a complex collage of landscape elements from a number of historic periods. It should not be surprising, therefore, that contemporary features generally comprise the most recent layer. In such a dynamic system, there is a continuing element of growth, modification, and development. While any rural landscape derives its primary significance from a particular historic period, alterations or additions may have achieved a significance of their own. The fact that a landscape component has changed over time tends only to increase its significance.

Recognizing that places may represent more than one historical period is vital to understanding rural landscapes, and to any discussion of the significance and integrity of a rural historic district. The continuum of land-use and landscape modification, by definition, reflect changes in human beliefs, available technologies, and forces external to the cultural group(s) primarily responsible.

Components/Features/Patterns

Understanding the combination of landscape forces which defines any rural landscape is the challenge. This combination is represented by landscape components, features, and patterns. When speaking of "landscape features" we generally limit the scope to natural physical elements. Landscape components include natural physical elements, but encompass material cultural elements as well. Patterns encompass the location and distribution of both the components and features within the landscape.

Three Examples of Rural Landscapes

Three examples may further explain the concept of landscape components. An agricultural valley contains a number of small farms and farmsteads. These sites consist primarily of small houses, associated outbuildings, and fences, distributed evenly throughout the valley. While many of the structures emerged during the valley's historic period, 1870-1930, some are more recent. In fact, some structures have been removed, burned, abandoned, or replaced by newer dwellings. Other associated landscape components, such as fences, tree lines, and roads have also undergone change.

From a strictly historical perspective, certain elements of the valley no longer retain individual significance or integrity as defined by the National Register criteria. They have been altered beyond recognition, removed, or intruded upon by other, non-historic features. However, considering the rural landscape as a dynamic entity, this valley is clearly significant and retains its integrity. Why?

First, we must consider the remaining original features. While some buildings have changed, the buildings alone do not define the landscape. For example, the placement of features in the landscape (landscape spatial organization), the processes of landscape modification (land-use: categories and activities), the way the people move through the valley (circulation networks), the organization of each farm (cluster arrangement), and the way trees and shrubs were planted, either for functional or ornamental purposes

(vegetation related to land-use) work together to shape the characteristic appearance of the valley.

After documenting and analyzing these features, it becomes possible to determine whether the rural landscape has changed substantially or whether it still retains its historic integrity. The houses, while important as cultural resources, may be equally important for their placement in the landscape and their scale, rather than their individual integrity as historic structures. In this valley, the placement and location of the houses represents an important cultural pattern. This pattern and the associated landscape components indicate how people used the land during its historic period.

Organization may be a primary element in rural landscapes, but, alone, it doesn't establish integrity. A substantial number of historic features must be present. However, for a rural landscape to retain integrity (in the context of this discussion and the National Register), its organization must be understandable from both an historic and a contemporary perspective. Ultimately, this can only be accomplished through a present-day analysis of historic information.

The second example is a multi-resource island landscape which includes agriculture, small towns, and fishing villages. In this case, an historic district appears on the National Register, based primarily upon the architecture within its boundaries. However, the listing is being revised to include the landscape. With its long sloping fields, it serves as the unifying element that gives the structure definition. The remaining area consists of rural landscape resources. Viewed from a strictly historical perspective, the landscape components in this district have changed over time. New houses have been added. Some features, including houses, fence lines, and field patterns, have been removed.

Rapid alteration threatens the present-day landscape in this example. Agricultural land, significant in the development of the historic district, may be sub-divided and removed from production. The inability to meet the economic forces creating land-use change may be traced to two factors: inability to understand significant cultural values expressed in the landscape; and inadequate management tools with which to ensure its continued presence and viability. New management options, such as the transfer of development rights and a local trust landuse board, might safeguard the rural landscape from development pressures.

The third example is an agricultural and horse-farming landscape, with property lines and field patterns substantially unchanged for one hundred and fifty years. The significance of this landscape resides primarily in the architecture, which includes many structures individually eligible for the National Register. The district, however, depends on the integrity of the landscape form, spaces, and organization. While land use within the district has recently changed, the integrity of the district, as defined by the architecture, remains intact. While the architecture cannot exist in its present form without the surrounding landscape or land use, neither can the landscape provide the significant components for a rural historic district.

Each of these examples illustrates an important point—that applied procedures should be appropriate to the landscape and to the architecture of the rural historic district. While some districts contain examples of all the known landscape components, others will have only a few. This country is rich in both natural and cultural splendor. However, we as a people are less inclined to recognize the cultural value of the landscapes which we see around us. Rural cultural landscapes can appropriately serve as both a model and a study area for understanding that blend of natural and cultural splendor.

Specific rural cultural landscapes may best be understood as complex human ecological systems existing within equally complex natural ecological contexts. People modify those ecological contexts, and in turn the cultural patterns of the people are altered to fit the natural environment.

Related Work

Much recent work, both within and outside the National Park Service, has addressed a multitude of issues concerning rural landscapes. An attempt to identify landscape features and components in order to develop specific management plans as well as land protection plan options have been made.

Each of these studies has added to our knowledge of the problems and the potentials associated with rural landscapes in the parks. They have also pointed out the need for a usable, straight-forward system and methodology for addressing identification, evaluation, registration and management of these cultural resources.

Work outside of the National Park Service falls within two broad categories: work concerned with landscape understanding, and work concerned with landscape protection and management. Landscape understanding has focused on the need to comprehend a landscape, sometimes in great detail and sometimes in useful generalities. Practiced largely by geographers, this effort has been directed toward building landscape theory and practice. Its usefulness lies in helping us recognize the value of cultural landscapes, and adapt other methods to management needs.

In the second category, rural landscape management has been concerned less with preservation than with the practicality and feasibility of proposed plans. Significant work in this area is being done by the National Trust for Historic Preservation through its Rural Project. The goal-of the Rural Project is to unite the efforts of people working with natural and cultural resources and people concerned with agricultural land retention.

In a related area, visual resource management techniques have been used by resource managers to describe the scenic values of landscape. Although a useful tool, visual resource management does not address the complexity of cultural and historic meaning in a landscape. For example, an expansive, flat agricultural landscape may receive a low scenic value rating in terms of diversity, or because farmsteads may be considered visual intrusions. This same landscape, however, may have significant cultural value within its region or geographical content.

Since 1978, the Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation has brought together a variety of people working in historic and cultural landscape preservation. This interdisciplinary group, as well as other professional organizations like the Olmsted Parks Association, the Society of Architectural Historians, the Association for Preservation Technology, and the George Wright Society, are all working to understand and manage historic and cultural landscapes.

A Final Thought

It would be foolish to suggest that the concern for rural landscapes is in no way related to the joy of wheat fields, the excitement of zinc mines, or the sheer pleasure of fence lines arrayed across the prairie. The attempt to delineate and codify rural landscape resources is being made in part so that our underlying passion may somehow be excused. It is the passion, however, of individuals, of groups, of our society, which legitimately lays claim to the true origin of this work. In our attempt and desire to approach these resources logically and equitably, it would be a shame to deny that passion, which, it might be added, is a rightful descendant of the desire to create the rural landscapes which we now seek to protect.

The author is Associate Professor of Landscape Architecture at the University of Oregon. A copy of CULTURAL LANDSCAPES: RURAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS IN THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM, the report from which the preceding material was taken, is available through Park Historic Architecture, WASO. Thanks to Kenneth Helphand for permission to use the title "Landscape Thinking."

Standards For Managing Historic Rural Landscape Districts

The following standards, in addition to General Standards in NPS-28, should be used when managing historic rural landscape districts.

1. Every reasonable effort will be made to use a rural landscape for its historically intended purpose or to provide a compatible use that requires minimal alteration to its distinguishing natural and cultural components.
2. The distinguishing qualities or character of a rural landscape must not be destroyed. Historic material and distinctive natural components are not to be altered or removed.
3. All rural landscapes will be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis are prohibited.
4. Changes that may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of the rural landscape and its natural and cultural components. If these changes have significance in their own right, that significance should be recognized and respected.
5. Distinctive natural and cultural components which characterize the rural landscape shall be treated with sensitivity.
6. Distinctive natural and man-made components will be repaired rather than replaced whenever possible. If replacement is necessary, the new component should match the old in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities such as weathering characteristics. Repair or replacement of missing components will be based on accurate duplications rather than on conjectural designs.
7. All treatment work that may affect surface or subsurface archeological resources must be evaluated by an archeologist.
8. Alterations and additions to the rural landscape required to accommodate a new use is acceptable when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant natural or cultural components and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the landscape.
9. Additions or alterations may not impair a rural landscape's essential form and integrity.

Two CRM Data Bases:

Resources For Management

Alicia Stamm

The List of Classified Structures (LCS) and the Cultural Resources Management Bibliography (CRBIB) data bases assist cultural resources personnel on a park, region, and WASO level in recording and making planning and management decisions. Secondly, they provide data and knowledge to professionals, scholars, and the public. Together, both systems offer information on over 11,000 park historic structures (description, location, and condition). Over 7,000 reports, documents, and publications are recorded as well as archeological sites, artifacts, and historical objects.

Eventually both systems will interface with the National Register, the Historic American Buildings Survey/ Historic American Engineering Record, the Cultural Sites Inventory, the National Catalog, and the Archeological Data Base. Thus, information may be coordinated and shared between data bases offering the user maximum access, update, and retrieval.

List of Classified Structures

The List of Classified Structures is an evaluated inventory of all historic and prehistoric structures with archeological, historical, architectural/ engineering, or cultural value, in which the National Park Service has or will acquire any legal interest. The LCS was created in 1960 from recommendations made at a meeting of the Regional Directors and the Chiefs of the NPS Eastern and Western Offices of Design and Construction. In the early 1970s, a draft inventory of historic buildings and structures evolved into the LCS. In 1975-1977, the LCS was updated, computerized, and revitalized with new management and information categories.

The function of the LCS is: (1) to maintain an inventory of historic structures, their identification, location, significance and function; (2) to maintain documentation information about these structures, including reports, studies, projects, and measured drawings; and (3) to maintain information to assist park and regional managers to make management decisions. As an automated data base, the LCS allows for the manipulation and retrieval of data on a variety of levels.

The LCS contains summary information such as IDLCS identification number, structure number, NPS organization code, the name of the structure, NPS legal interest, type of structure, composition, period of construction, National Register status, etc. Such information is not complete for all NPS historic structures, but the LCS is currently being updated to accomplish this.

Cultural Resources Management Bibliography

The CRBIB developed from the "Preliminary Bibliographical Inventory of Park Historical and Architecture Studies" issued in March 1972. It contained all historical and architectural research reports in the files of the Washington Office. This bibliography expanded to include Servicewide and archeological reports, was updated and computerized in 1975-1977.

The CRBIB functions as: (1) an indicator to park and regional managers of the current status of required planning documents; and (2) as a reference tool allowing for the retrieval of information by geographic location (park, region, Servicewide), alphabetically by author or title, chronologically by date, and by study type or area (history, architecture, archeology, or curatorial services). The CRBIB contains the following

information: identification number (the "BIBNUM"), author, title, date, number of pages, volumes, graphics, report location, study type, IDLCS reference, and NPS organization code.

Future Needs

In the past year, both the LCS and the CRBIB have been completed as originally designed. Error files have been corrected and eliminated; new reports have been designed and distributed, backlogs of input forms have been completed and entered; new data entry programs utilizing a microcomputer have been developed and implemented; documentation, including a User Manual, has been completed; and on line "ready-only" access has been made available.

However, data elements need to be added, revised, and standardized to coordinate with other cultural resources data bases. In addition, both systems need to be reevaluated to better serve regional and WASO needs. Comments, suggestions, and corrections to existing data are all welcome and should be addressed to Alicia Stamm, Park Historic Architecture Division, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240; or phone 202/343-8149. Those who wish to use the new on-line access program should also contact Alicia Stamm.

The author is with the Park Historic Architecture Division, WASO.

Many reports listed on the CRBIB are missing from the repository in the Washington Office. These reports are indicated by an "=" in front of the title in the computer system. If you have a copy of any report(s) that should be included in the CRBIB, a copy for inclusion in the repository and/or for reproduction would be appreciated. All donations or loans should be referred to Alicia Stamm.

Resolving A Preservation Problem At Mesa Verde

Toby Raphael

Allen S. Bohnert

The museum collection at Mesa Verde National Park contains some of the most extensive and varied examples of perishable prehistoric artifacts in the National Park Service. The environmental conditions of the region have contributed to the preservation of archeological materials which have either disappeared or deteriorated beyond recognition in other geographic areas. Baskets, mats, cotton cloth, yucca fiber/turkey feather blankets, sandals, bone ornaments and tools, wooden items, desiccated human remains and other objects composed of organic material are common finds in many Mesa Verde archeological sites.

The demand for access to these objects is high because they provide exceptional insight into the behavior and material culture of the prehistoric populations of the Southwest. The sensitive nature of the materials, together with the fragile and often fragmentary condition of the objects, provide curators with a tremendous challenge in achieving their long-term preservation. The challenge becomes even more pressing when one considers the demand for access and use of this cultural resource.

The dilemma facing archeological collections management in general was well stated by Richard Ford at a conference which addressed these issues in 1977. He said:

> To state a national problem as succinctly as possible: significant anthropological research cannot be conducted because many are imperiled if they are moved or even handled. They are an irreplaceable national resource whose destruction is actually accelerated when they are studied in their present condition. Yet paradoxically, if they are left alone and their research potential and education value are ignored, they will continue to deteriorate because of inappropriate storage facilities and physical environments.

The basic requirements for long-term preservation of these irreplaceable resources include providing suitable storage protection and stable environmental conditions. We are, however, aware of our responsibility to make the museum collection available for research or educational purposes, as well as to encourage other nondestructive use, whenever possible. It is obvious that long-term preservation and use are not always compatible "activities," particularly when simply handling or examining many objects cause further damage or at least encourage deterioration.

Storage Project

The staff at Mesa Verde recognized the benefits of housing objects in their own protective containers as an aid to solving both research and preservation problems. Together with the conservation staff at Harpers Ferry Center, a "containerization project" was designed in which individualized, object-specific containers were developed. Our aim was to fulfill the requirements for long-term object protection while meeting the researcher's needs for access to the object. Such storage constructions were developed to be compatible with the park's potential exhibit needs as well.

The "containerization project" became a natural outgrowth of a systematic approach to assessing and meeting the conservation needs of the park collection. For some time, the park has practiced an on-going comprehensive conservation program, based on and evolving from two management documents: a *Conservation Needs Survey* and a *Collection Management Plan*.

The authors drew up the proposal for the "containerization project" which began this past summer. With the park superintendent's support, the University of Delaware's Winterthur Conservation Program was approached for consideration of the project as part of its student summer work program. The Conservation Department agreed to make the project available. Two graduate students, Mark Aronson and Annette Manick, decided to undertake the Mesa Verde summer work.

Summer Work Project

The summer project began with a meeting at the conservation laboratories in Harpers Ferry. The authors described the scope and the goals of the project to the interns and reviewed container designs.

Acceptable conservation materials and potentially useful designs were selected at this time. Materials ordered for the project were carefully selected for their high quality, suitability, and long-term stability. A variety of naturally and synthetically manufactured materials were used. Synthetics allowed for cushioning and three dimensional form-making. They included polyester transparent windows (Mylar), polyester fiber batting (Dacron), mini-cell, cross-linked polyethylene foam (Volara), and polyethylene closed cell foam (Ethafoam).

Paper products comprised the exterior structure of the containers. Those most used were 2- and 4-ply, all-rag mat board; 60 point, lignin free, buffered corrugated board. An innovative new box board was used that contained a central polyester laminate to prevent the entry of harmful chemicals, acids, and moisture. Boards were often wrapped with prewashed 100% cotton fabric. Boxes were fastened with starch paste and cotton/polyester twill tape.

Each container, intended for use in standard storage cabinets, enveloped the artifact in a protected micro-environment, providing one more protective shield and serving to buffer its contents from the elements. They have proven very useful in isolating vulnerable archeological material from numerous agents of deterioration. The containers were designed to reduce the fluctuation of both temperature and humidity, eliminate many airborne pollutants, prevent biological attack, and provide security from unintentional human abuse. Visual access to both sides of most objects was a high priority to enable researchers to examine the materials without actually handling them.

The Winterthur conservation interns participated in the park project for two busy months. They demonstrated remarkable innovation in their designs for housing both two- and three-dimensional objects. They worked to resolve the storage needs of objects ranging from prehistoric yucca sandals to desiccated adult human remains.

Containers could not be constructed for every object in the collection during the limited time frame of the project. However, the materials and methods used to make the storage containers remain readily available and relatively easy to work with. These factors, combined with the park staff's intimate knowledge of the needs of individual objects, help ensure the continuation of the project by park staff.

The summer project not only afforded custom-made, protective storage to a large number of fragile, perishable items, but also helped develop a variety of container styles which may be useful in other park collections.

The concept of preserving objects through individualized containers especially effects archeological collections, where the usefulness of objects often depends on their unchanged and uncontaminated condition. In dealing with these collections, "less" really is "more." The less we do directly to the artifacts, the more we allow future viewers and researchers to objectively see the past.

Toby Raphael is a Conservator with the Harpers Ferry Center. Allen S. Bohnert is a Museum Specialist at Mesa Verde National Park.

Remembering Saint-Gaudens:

A Look At His Life and Time Through What He Left

Sarah Olson

When Secretary of State John Hay visited Augustus Saint-Gaudens in 1904, Saint-Gaudens' house struck Hay as "exotic."[1] Situated in the hills of Cornish, New Hampshire with dramatic views of the Connecticut River and Mount Ascutney, the house was the first among several artists' residences associated with the Cornish Colony. Due to the efforts of Saint-Gaudens' widow who was instrumental in incorporating a Memorial to preserve the site in 1919, this "exotic" house, studios, and their contents survive largely intact at Saint-Gaudens National Historical Site. The level of documentation with which these furnishings have been accompanied into the present have allowed for the remarkably accurate preservation of Saint-Gaudens' home and studio. Designated a National Historic Site in 1964, the house and studio stand today among the most interpretively successful furnished structures in the country. The reason is largely because they accurately reflect a life marked by visual creativity, and because Saint-Gaudens' reputation as an artist assured the preservation of his domestic and work environments as well as his sculpture. The following article illustrates the abundance of documentation available on the furnishings at the National Historic Site. Tourism has been promoted at the Saint-Gaudens site since the sculptor's death in 1907. That year, the NEW YORK TIMES characterized the house interior as one of "... refinement, artisticness, and repose," describing rooms filled with "handsome antique mahogany furniture, paintings and sculpture of great merit, old silver, costly rugs, and other evidences of artistic taste."[2] In 1915, and again in 1924, Adeline Adams, wife of sculptor Herbert Adams and one of the Cornish group, wrote up the house for the magazines ART AND PROGRESS and ARCHITECTURE. She described a strong presence felt there of the "bright spirits of the day in arts closely akin to the art of sculpture." To Mrs. Adams, Saint-Gaudens' artist and architect friends formed "part and parcel" of the sculptor's house.[3]

Augustus Saint-Gaudens and his wife Augusta first came to Cornish in 1885 at the suggestion of Charles Coatsworth Beaman, a New York lawyer with extensive land holdings in the Cornish area. They rented from Beaman until 1891 when they bought the property for $2500, and the promise of a portrait of Beaman which Saint-Gaudens produced in 1894.[4] They christened the property Aspet after Saint-Gaudens' ancestral village in southern France.

The house Saint-Gaudens bought from Beaman was a sizable red brick structure dating from the late eighteenth century. Initially, Saint-Gaudens found the house "forbidding and relentless," and he imagined "a skeleton half-hanging out of the window, shrieking and dangling in the gale..."[5] He modified the "relentlessness" of the stark vertical structure by adding deep pergolas to the gable ends which gave the front elevation a horizontal orientation and tied the house into the surrounding landscape. He also constructed classical style garden fences, mounting Greek heads on the posts. The consultant for the alterations was the New York architect and Saint-Gaudens' friend, George Fletcher Babb, who later supervised the construction of a new studio on the property after Saint-Gaudens' primary production studio burned to the ground in 1904.

At Babb's suggestion, Saint-Gaudens painted the house white. Later, in keeping with what Saint-Gaudens' niece remembered as her uncle's "passion" for white, he painted white all the mahogany furniture in one of the bedrooms. Mrs. Daniel Chester French, who summered in Cornish with her husband in the early 1890s, and visited

thereafter, formed the impression that "Saint-Gaudens had done everything to (Aspet) that he could think of to make it as little like New England as possible."[7]

The Saint-Gaudens remodeled the interior of the house in 1894 and 1895, creating a double parlor and installing full-length wall benches at each end.[8] They re-created in the house many features of their Paris apartments where they lived from 1877 to 1880, immediately following their marriage. Two paintings now at the site by Augusta Saint-Gaudens of their apartment at No. 3 Rue Herschel in Paris show highly eclectic decorative tastes developed abroad that reappeared at Aspet. The Saint-Gaudens lined the Rue Herschel walls with grass matting, tapestries, and oriental carpets, upon which they superimposed paintings as well as plaster casts from classical sculpture. The couple bought Renaissance as well as French Empire furniture in Paris, concentrating on no particular period. They also amassed a collection of Japanese prints.

The Japanese prints and furniture, including a table bought at the 1878 Exposition, were displayed at Aspet as were the rugs and French Empire armchair painted in Paris by Augusta. Likewise, the Saint-Gaudens duplicated in their Aspet parlors and dining room the grass matting walls hung with tapestries and paintings.

Aspet contained Thomas Dewing's portrait of Augusta Saint-Gaudens, painted in Cornish in 1886, as well as works by George de Forest Brush, John Twachtman, Stanford White, and others. The most remarkable work in the house was John Singer Sargent's 1890 portrait of Augusta and Homer Saint-Gaudens which hung in the dining room next to the gilded cast of Victory from the balustrade of the Temple of Athena Nike.

As in Paris, Mrs. Saint-Gaudens scoured the Cornish area for antiques, buying a Federal period sideboard in 1895.[9] In 1899 she inherited furniture from her mother's Roxbury, Massachusetts house, including a heavily carved American Empire sofa as well as several eighteenth-century side chairs.[10] A circa 1899 photograph survives of Aspet's north parlor. Seen in the reflection of a Federal mirror that Augusta inherited from her mother is the wicker chair so common to Cornish homes of the period. Freely mixing periods and styles, the Saint-Gaudens also altered. antiques to suit their taste, hiring the local painter, Charles Ingalls, to paint and decorate two sets of Federal period fancy chairs in 1896. They hired Ingalls the previous year to decorate a buggy.[11]

Clearly the Saint-Gaudens embraced the mania for collecting begun in the last decades of the nineteenth century and fueled by works like Anne Hollingsworth Wharton's THROUGH COLONIAL DOORWAYS, a book that Saint-Gaudens owned. And evidence of the colonial revival appears in period photographs of other Cornish homes.

But, as witnessed by Aspet's interiors, the colonial revival in Cornish was heavily modified by the eclectic, and even "exotic," tastes of its inhabitants. Saint-Gaudens' studio assistant, Frances Grimes, described the houses as: "Unconventional...but also in a way formal with a chosen formality like that of their pictures." Miss Grimes summed up Cornish homes as providing "a genial atmosphere in surroundings that were good to look at [12]

Saint-Gaudens became totally engrossed in the Little Studio remodeling project of 1903-04. In the REMINISCENCES OF AUGUSTUS SAINT-GAUDENS, Homer Saint-Gaudens described the project as representative of his father's urge to continually reorder his environment:

> The completion of this studio became the jest of the family as ramifications and complications were endless, though indeed we might have become used to such a state of affairs, as there was hardly a week in all the time my father spent on this place during twenty-two years that he did not have something rebuilt or regraded, to his intense enjoyment. Among the developments of the studio, however, it became especially interesting to watch the manner in which he applied his sense of color [13]

Saint-Gaudens intended his Little Studio as much as a place to contemplate and to present his work as to accomplish the work of sculpture. It was also a place for relaxation, containing wall benches on two sides and a billiard table. A firm believer in sports, Saint-Gaudens also installed at Aspet a swimming pool, a golf course mowed by grazing sheep, and toboggan slides descending from the various studio roofs.[14] As in the house, Saint-Gaudens displayed others' work in the studio, notably a bronze crucifix by John Singer Sargent and a bench designed by Stanford White, as well as casts from Classical and Renaissance Art.[15] Mounted on the studio pergola was a cast from the Parthenon frieze to which Saint-Gaudens periodically and painstakingly applied new color.[16]

Increasingly an invalid during the last years of his life, the sculptor spent long hours reclining on the Little Studio pergola. In June, 1905 the pergola was the stage for a banquet, "spread under twinkling Japanese lamps," culminating the "Masque of the Golden Bowl," an allegorical pageant recounted by the Cornish community in honor of Saint-Gaudens' twentieth anniversary there. Descriptions of the event have survived. The following is Maud Elliott's, the daughter of Julia Ward Howe and a member of the Cornish group:

> I have a vision of Maxfield Parrish who took the part of Chiron, the Centaur. He came clattering in followed by a group of scantily clad children. The crowning glory of the evening was the sibyl of the golden bowl, who slowly rose from behind the altar in a, cloud of smoke and fire that transfigured the temple and cast an opalescent light on the pines. Tall, with the bearing of a young goddess, she held above her head the golden bowl which the colony presented to Saint-Gaudens.[17]

Saint-Gaudens died on August 3, 1907. Memorial services were held in the Little Studio on August 7, and Saint-Gaudens was buried on the Aspet grounds. His grave is marked by a Roman style temple erected in 1914 after the temple designed in 1905 for the "Masque of the Golden Bowl."[18]

The 1982 publication of John Dryfhout's THE WORK OF AUGUSTUS SAINT-GAUDENS marked the first of several events that are indicative of Saint-Gaudens' growing reputation, and that are drawing increased attention to Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site. Plans exist to restage the "Masque of the Golden Bowl" at the site in June, 1985. Beginning in March, 1985 an exhibition on the Cornish artists organized by the University of New Hampshire will travel to the Thorne Sagendorph Gallery in Keene, New Hampshire, Dartmouth College, Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site and the Paul Art Center at the University of New Hampshire. Finally, in November, 1985, the Metropolitan Museum of Art will open a major exhibition of Saint-Gaudens' work.

Ultimately, these events only underline the significance of Saint-Gaudens contributions to American art. Indeed, the level of historic documentation which infuses all the objects within his home provides researchers and interpreters with a solid foundation with which to understand the man, his work and the century in which he lived.

Footnotes

1. Louisa Hall Tharp, *Saint-Gaudens and the Gilded Era* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1969), p. 310; U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, "Augustus Saint-Gaudens, The Man and His Art," by John W. Bond (Washington, D.C. 1969), p. 242 notes.

2. *The New York Times*, December 15, 1907.

3. Adeline Adams, "Aspet, the Home of Saint-Gaudens," *Art and Progress* 6 (April, 1915), 190: "The Saint-Gaudens Memorial," Architecture 49 (January, 1924), 2.

4. William H. Child, *History of the Town of Cornish* (Spartanburg, SC: Reprint Co., Publishers, 1975); Hugh Mason Wade, *A Brief History of Cornish*, 1763-1971 (Hanover, New Hampshire: The University Press of New England, 1976); John Dryfhout, *The Work of Augustus Saint-Gaudens* (Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 1982), pp. 64-65, 74.

5. Bond, p.52.

6. Bond, p. 22; Margaret Homer Schurcliff, *Lively Days, Some Memoirs of Margaret Homer Schurcliff* (Taipei: Literature House, Ltd., 1965), p. 88.

7. Mrs. Daniel Chester French, *Memories of a Sculptors Wife* (Cambridge, MA: Riverside Press, 1928), p. 183

8. Bond, pp. 16-17.

9. Saint-Gaudens; canceled checks, December 24, 1895, Saint-Gaudens Papers.

10. Estate Papers, Mrs. T. J. Homer, Ibid.

11. Notes on Ingalls by John Dryfhout, Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site.

12. Frances Grimes, Manuscripts dealing with her reminiscences of Augustus Saint-Gaudens, Cornish Colony, Louis Saint-Gaudens, and Saint-Gaudens' studio, Saint-Gaudens Papers.

13. Homer Saint-Gaudens, *The Reminiscences of Augustus Saint-Gaudens* (New York: The Century Co., 1913), p. 239.

14. Frances Grimes, Manuscripts: Augustus Saint-Gaudens to Homer Saint-Gaudens, January 6, 1902, Saint-Gaudens Papers.

15. D. Van Orden to Stanford White, January 11, 1882, Saint-Gaudens Papers.

16. Homer Saint-Gaudens, *The Reminiscences* p. 239; Frances Grimes, Manuscripts; Augustus to Augusta Saint-Gaudens, July 7, 1904, Saint-Gaudens Papers.

17. Wade, p. 78.

18. Dryfhout, p. 312.

The author is Chief, Division of Historic Furnishings, Harpers Ferry Center.